Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No.	Al	pplicant(s)	
	an/	09/705,668	В	OGGS ET AL.	
	ai y	Examiner	Ai	rt Unit	
		Aimee J Li	. 21	183	
All Participants:		Status of Application	: <u>Respo</u>	ns to Non-Fir	<u>าล/</u>
(1) <u>Aimee J Li</u> .		(3)			
(2) Joseph Lutz (Reg. No. 43,765).		(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>17 November 2004</u>		Time: <u>2:30pm</u>			
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:	• •	nt's representative)			
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed:  Double Patenting Rejection			•		
Claims discussed:					
Prior art documents discussed:  N/A		,			
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING TH See Continuation Sheet	E GENEF	RAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DI	SCUSSED:	
Part III.					
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sed directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sed did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief</li> </ul>	ation. The eparate re	examiner will provide a vecord of the substance of	written s	summary of the	he substance
			-		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	Applicant/	Applicant's Representativ	e Signa	ture – if appro	opriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Applicants's representative regarding filing a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the obviousness Double Patenting Rejection and making an Examiner's Amendment to claim 19. Claim 19 currently states "dispatching one of the plurality of instructions to an execution unit to be executed either when a counter for the instruction does not exceed a maximum number of replays..." with no other limitation clearly stating what the counter is counting. The other Independent claims 1 and 13 have a limitation stating "to increment a counter for each of the plurality of instructions to reflect the number of times each of the plurality of instructions has been executed", which clearly reflects what the counter is counting. The Examiner would like a similar limitation to be added to claim 19 to clarify what the counter is counting.